

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION V

DATE: MAY 27 1986

SUBJECT: BASF/Wyandotte Site
Consent Decree, Civil Action No. 80-73699

FROM: Bonnie Eleder, *Bonnie L. Eleder*
CES

TO: Connie Puchalski,
ORC

I have received a response from BASF Corporation to my letter of March 31, 1986, which is dated May 8, 1986 and is attached for your review. I have reviewed this letter in conjunction with other information EPA has received from BASF and with the Consent Decree. I believe there are several areas in which BASF, with respect to their monitoring program, is not in compliance with the requirements of the Consent Decree cited above. After you have reviewed the May 8, 1986 BASF letter and the file, I suggest we meet, to discuss what course of action EPA should take.

Specifically, I have reached the following conclusions:

- 1) Pursuant to Section V.B.1.a. (pg. 16), monitoring wells at nine locations, as per Appendix D, are required. Specifically, monitor well 7 is intended to serve as an upgradient well, and well 8 is intended to provide information about the site under the clay cover. Both of these wells were plugged and pulled as of June 19, 1985, and not replaced. It should also be noted that the Consent Decree does not have provisions for removal of monitor wells, except as inferred in Section V.B.5., as discussed in point 2.
- 2) Pursuant to Section V.B.5. (pg. 20-21), BASF may, after three years and a 60 day notice to EPA and MDNR, discontinue sampling a well that does not produce a sufficient amount of water for all analyses for six consecutive sampling periods. Wells numbered 4, 7, 8, and 10 are no longer sampleable due to having been plugged and pulled. These conditions were not met prior to the discontinuance of sampling of these wells.
- 3) BASF's letter states, in their answer to question 4, that EPA and MDNR "...concurred in the decision to abandon attempts to locate an upgradient well." I would question this in the light of the specific requirement given in the Consent Decree. Also, the trip report for the EPA project manager does not refer to this having been discussed.



In addition, I have some concern with the results from the monitor wells analyses we have been receiving. In particular, the levels of mercury and arsenic are high, and questionable are pentachlorophenol and naphthalene. I feel these results may be indicative that the remedial actions taken pursuant to the Consent Decree may not be of sufficient scope to prevent the contaminants from leaving the site. A problem, here, though, is what standards do we compare the sample results to. Also, how are we assured that the collection, handling, and analytical procedures of these samples (quality assurance/quality control) are as it states through reference in the Consent Decree (Section V.B.4., pg. 20)? Perhaps EPA should be splitting some of these samples for comparison of the results.

Let me know when we can set up our meeting. I suggest that you and I get together first, and then we meet with Roger Field and Tim O'Mara.

Thanks, Connie.